



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,183	12/31/2003	David P. Marmaros	16113-1317001 / GP-178-00	5002
26192 7590 09/15/2011 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER TRUONG, CAM Y T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2169				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/15/2011		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/750,183	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MARMAROS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> CAM-Y TRUONG	<b>Art Unit</b> 2169	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CAM-Y TRUONG (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Paul E. Franz (Attorney) (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 8/29/2011.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Issues Discussed ☐101 ☐112 ☐102 ☒103 ☐Others  
(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Substance of Interview**  
(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

*Applicant's representative argued that the combination of Cupps, Schneider and O'Donnell does not teach or suggest the claimed active snippet link "including an instruction that causes the client device to navigate directly to the portion of the corresponding search result document from which the query-relevant snippet is extracted when the corresponding active snippet link is selected by a user". Examiner pointed that Hennings teaches that limitation as shown in fig. 2, col. 6, lines 47-60. There was no argument reached.*

**Applicant recodation instructions:** It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

**Examiner recodation instructions:** Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recodation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recodation, including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment

/CAM-Y TRUONG/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169	
---------------------------------------------------	--